UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,870	03/12/2001	Philippe Morin	9432-000134	9173

27572 7590 06/26/2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER	
VO, HUYEN X	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/803,870	MORIN, PHILIPPE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huyen X. Vo	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *3/12/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in view of Beyda et al. (US 6487277) necessitated by claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda et al. (US 6487277) in view of Rigsby et al. (US 60556971).

4. Regarding claims 1, 2, and 15, Beyda et al. disclose a method of and a voice binding for navigating a menu structure within an electronic product, comprising the steps of: identifying a path sequence by which a first location within a menu would be reached by user navigation to said first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product (*col. 6, line 48 to col. 8, line 37*); associating a specific utterance with said path sequence by which said first location would be reached and generating therefrom a stored first location (*col. 7, lines 52-61, speech command*

representative of digits (3, 1) is inherently associated with the path); obtaining a second utterance of speech (*col. 7, lines 52-61, speech command representative of digits (3, 1) inputted at runtime*); matching said second utterance with said model of said first utterance to identify said stored first location within said menu (*col. 4, lines 49-67, inherent functionality of a voice recognition system*); and subsequently navigating to said first location in response to said matching by automatically performing said path sequence (*col. 7, lines 52-61 the user would then proceed to that particular function upon recognition of input speech command*).

Beyda et al. fail to specifically disclose the steps of obtaining a first utterance of speech comprising at least one word chosen by a user of said electronic product; storing said first utterance of speech chosen by said user as a model in a user-built lexicon; and associating said first utterance with a function. However, Rigsby et al. teach the steps of obtaining a first utterance of speech comprising at least one word chosen by a user of said electronic product (*step 210 in figure 2*); storing said first utterance of speech chosen by said user as a model in a user-built lexicon (*steps 220-230 in figure 2*); and associating said first utterance with a function (*step 220-230 in figure 2*).

Since Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Beyda et al. by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in order to enable users to navigate to a desired function more rapidly.

5. Regarding claims 3-5, 17-18, and 21-22, Beyda et al. further disclose storing said navigation path as a sequence of navigation steps leading to said first location (*col. 8, lines 1-37*), storing said navigation path as a semantic sequence of navigation steps leading to said first location (*col. 8, lines 1-37*), wherein said menu structure includes associated text (*col. 8, lines 1-37, balance can be represented by alphanumeric*) and said method further comprises storing said navigation path as a semantic sequence of text associated with the navigation steps leading to said first location (*col. 8, lines 1-37*).

6. Regarding claim 6, Beyda et al. disclose the step of associating speech models with a particular navigation path (*col. 7, lines 52-61, speech command representative of digits (3, 1) is inherently associated with the path*), but fail to specifically disclose the step of constructing a speech model associated with said first utterance and associating said speech model with said navigation path. However, Rigsby et al. further disclose the step of constructing a speech model associated with said first utterance and associating said speech model with said navigation path (*steps 220-230 in figure 2*).

Since Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Beyda et al. by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in order to enable users to navigate to a desired function more rapidly.

7. Regarding claims 7-8, Beyda et al. further disclose using a speech recognizer to compare said first and second utterances in performing said matching step (*col. 4, lines*

49-67, inherent functionality of a voice recognition system by comparing input speech command with stored models to determine a match), and constructing a speech model associated with said first utterance and using said speech model to populate the lexicon of speech recognizer (*col. 4, line 49-67, voice recognition unit must include speech models*); and using said speech recognizer to compare said first and second utterances in performing said matching step (*col. 4, lines 49-67, inherent functionality of a voice recognition system by comparing input speech command with stored models to determine a match*).

8. Regarding claim 9, Beyda et al. fail to specifically disclose the method of claim 2 wherein said step of identifying a user-selected navigation path comprises displaying said first location on a visible display associated with said electronic product and prompting said user to provide said utterance. However, Rigsby et al. further teach step of identifying a user-selected navigation path comprises displaying said first location on a visible display associated with said electronic product and prompting said user to provide said utterance (*figure 2, element 210 and figure 3*).

Since Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Beyda et al. by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in order to enable users to navigate to a desired function more rapidly.

9. Regarding claim 16, Beyda et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice binding system of claim 15 wherein said menu navigator includes at least one navigation button operable to traverse said menu structure. However, Rigsby et al. teach the voice binding of claim 15, wherein said menu navigator includes at least one navigation button operable to traverse said menu structure (*figure 3, element 350*).

Since Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Beyda et al. by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in order to provide hearing impaired users visual navigation buttons to traverse menu structure.

10. Claim 10-14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda et al. (US 6487277) in view of Rigsby et al. (US 60556971), as applied to claims 2 and 15, and further in view of De Armas et al. (US 5873064).

11. Regarding claims 10-14 and 19-20, Beyda et al. fail to specifically disclose the step of providing user feedback of the association between said first utterance and said navigation path by said first location on a visible display associated with said electronic product and producing an audible representation of said first utterance, wherein said audible representation is provided by storing said first utterance as audio data and replaying said audio data at user request, and wherein said textual representation is provided using a speech recognizer. However, Rigsby et al. further teach the

navigation path by the first location on a visible display associated with the electronic product and producing a textual representation of the first utterance (*figures 2-3*).

Since Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Beyda et al. by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in order to enable the hearing impaired users to confirm trained command.

The modified Beyda et al. still fail to disclose the step of providing user an audio feedback of the first utterance, the feedback is a textual representation using a speech recognizer, and feedback is provided upon user's request. However, De Armas et al. teach the step of providing user an audio feedback of the first utterance (F*ig.1A, elements Child 1, OK and CANCEL; col.5, ln.2-15 and col.9, ln. 49-61*), the feedback is a textual representation using a speech recognizer (*decoded phrase*), and feedback is provided upon user's request (*Fig. 2, col. 6, ln.19-28; col. 8, 1n.25-29 and col.9, ln.19-61*).

Since the modified Beyda et al. and De Armas et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Beyda et al. by incorporating the teaching of De Armas et al. in order to enable the user to confirm input command to train for a particular function.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV

6/19/2006

***

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER